



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,493	02/04/2002	Steven Siong Cheak Mok	1414-002-PWH	7068

60597 7590 06/25/2008
HANCOCK HUGHEY LLP
P.O. BOX 6553
PORTLAND, OR 97228

EXAMINER

COBANOGLU, DILEK B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/067,493	Applicant(s) MOK ET AL.	
	Examiner DILEK B. COBANOGLU	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12-17, 19-21, 23-34, 37-41, 43-46, 48-53, 55-57 and 59-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12-17, 19-21, 23-34, 37-41, 43-46, 48-53, 55-57 and 59-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/21/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to amendment received on 3/12/2008. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-17, 19-21, 23-34, 37-41, 43-46, 48-53, 55-57, 59-70 remain pending in this application with the previous and recent claim cancellations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 12-17, 19-21, 28, 30-34, 37-41, 43-44, 48-53, 55-57, 64, 66-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldenberg (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0065682), Causey, III et al. (hereinafter Causey) (U.S. Patent No. 6,641,533) and further in view of Stutman et al. (hereinafter Stutman) (5,416,695).

A. Claims 1 and 37 have been amended now to recite a health-care system and method comprising:

- i. a processing machine, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2; ¶ 19, 20, 40, 41);
- ii. a plurality of biosensors respectively equipped to individuals, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2; ¶ 19, 20, 40, 41); each of the biosensors being operable to gather information regarding physiological parameters

of the respective individuals, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2; ¶ 19, 20, 40, 41); and relay the information to the processing machine over a network, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2, 8; ¶ 19, 20, 40, 41, 57-64); and

iii. data links provided from the processing machine to respective providers of a plurality of different health-care services to allow the transmission of instructions over the network for appropriate action to be taken in response to a determination that an individual is likely to suffer from a medical condition, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2, 8; ¶ 33, 35, 62-64).

iv. a database storing medical records of at least some of the individuals, said medical records including details of current medication, previous illnesses and allergies, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Fig. 4, 5; ¶ 16, 29, 33, 40, 49);

v. wherein the processing machine is operable to detect when said gathered information received from one of said biosensors is outside predetermined limits and so warrants immediate attention of any of said health care services and immediately present this information to said health care service.

Goldenberg fails to disclose a personal data storage unit associated with one of the individuals, wherein; said medical records are stored on the personal data storage unit. However, such a system is well-known as evidenced by Causey, (Causey, fig.

21, col. 9, lines 8-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Goldenberg and Causey. The motivation would have been to provide an improved PDA device that allows a user to avoid the inconvenience of carrying multiple electronic devices to test for the same value or characteristic, (Causey, col. 2, lines 6-16).

Goldenberg fails to disclose the processing machine is operable to detect when said gathered information received from one of said biosensors is outside predetermined limits and so warrants immediate attention of any of said health care services and immediately present this information to said health care service.

However, such a system is well-known as evidenced by Stutman, (Stutman; abstract, col. 2, lines 9-25, col. 3, lines 9-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Goldenberg and Stutman. The motivation would have been to notifying the medical personnel of a medical condition of the patient requiring attention (Stutman, col. 2, lines 9-25).

B. As per claims 2 and 38, Goldenberg discloses a system and method further comprising a first terminal connected to the processing machine and operable to present information received from one or more of the biosensors to

allow the determination of whether the individual associated with the one or more biosensors is likely to suffer from a medical condition, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2, 8; ¶ 33, 35, 62-64).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

C. As per claims 3, 4, 39 and 40, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein at least some of the data links comprise links over the network, wherein the network is the Internet, (Goldenberg, ¶ 29).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

D. As per claims 5 and 41, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the network comprises a wireless network, (Goldenberg, ¶ 9, 58).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

E. As per claims 7 and 43, Goldenberg discloses a system and method further comprising a delivery device operable to administer automatically a dose of a substance to an individual, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2, 8; ¶ 33, 35, 62-64).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

F. As per claims 8 and 44, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the delivery device is controllable by the processing machine,

(Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1, 2, 8; ¶ 29).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

G. As per claims 12 and 48, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the processing machine is operable to update the database following the receipt of information from one of the biosensors, (Goldenberg, Fig. 7; ¶ 55, 56).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

H. As per claims 13 and 49, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the processing machine is operable to present at least some of the records relating to an individual along with data received from a biosensor relating to that individual, (Goldenberg, Fig. 7; ¶ 55, 56).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

I. As per claims 14 and 50, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the processing machine is operable to allow real-time consultation over the network between one of the individuals and a health-care expert, (Goldenberg. ¶10).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

J. As per claims 15 and 51, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the processing machine is operable to allow at least one further party to

join the real- time consultation, (Goldenberg, ¶ 10).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

K. As per claims 16 and 52, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the real-time consultation comprises video conferencing, (Goldenberg, ¶ 9, 10, 61).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

L. As per claims 17 and 53, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the individuals are selected from the group comprising: health-care users, outpatients, in-patients and intensive care patients, (Goldenberg, Abstract).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

M. As per claims 19 and 55, Goldenberg discloses a system and method further comprising a personal data storage unit associated with one of the individuals operable to receive and store data from a biosensor, (Goldenberg, ¶ 63, 64) (disclosing treatment device for receiving, analyzing and sending medical treatment information that is considered to include a storage device or medium).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

N. As per claims 20 and 56, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the personal data unit is used to identify an individual to a biosensor before the biosensor gathers the information from the individual, (Goldenberg, Fig. 1; ¶ 40, 42).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

O. As per claims 21 and 57, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the plurality of biosensors are operable to gather information on selected physiological parameters in dependence upon the identity of an individual, (Goldenberg, Fig. 1; ¶ 27, 40, 42).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

P. As per claims 28 and 64, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the portable processing device is operable to analyze data received from the personal data storage unit to determine whether at least one of the physical parameters of an individual with which one of the biosensors is associated is outside predetermined limits, (Goldenberg, ¶ 55, 63, 64) (disclosing treatment device for receiving, analyzing and sending medical treatment information that is considered to include a storage device or medium).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

Q. As per claims 30 and 66, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the health-care services are selected from the group comprising: a pharmacy, a physician, an emergency service; a medical hardware supplier; a nutritionist; a source of health-care information; a health-care related government body; a nursing care centre; a research facility; a health insurance broker; and a financial institution, (Goldenberg, Abstract, ¶¶ 54-56)(disclosing a physician).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

R. As per claims 31 and 67, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein one of the health-care services comprise a source of medical records having features selected from the group comprising bio-data, health-care records, a health-care calendar, and a financial calendar, (Goldenberg, Abstract, ¶¶ 59)(disclosing bio-data such as vital signs).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

S. As per claims 32 and 68, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the processing machine is operable to transmit information regarding a condition that an individual has or is likely to develop to the individual, (Goldenberg, Abstract; Figs. 1,2, 8; ¶¶ 33, 35, 62-64).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

T. As per claims 33 and 69, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein the information is relayed to the processing machine over the network in an encrypted form, the encryption being specific to the individual to whom the information relates, (Goldenberg, Fig. 1; ¶ 40).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

U. As per claims 34 and 70, Goldenberg discloses a system and method wherein an individual has an identification number and the gathered information for the individual is encrypted with the identification number into a data packet for decryption by the processing machine, (Goldenberg, Fig. 1; ¶ 40, 42).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

4. Claims 9, 10, 23, 25, 27, 45, 46, 59, 61, 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldenberg in view of Causey and Stutman, and further in view of Nelson et al. (hereinafter Nelson) (U.S. 6,418,346).

A. As per claims 9 and 45, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method further comprising a location tracking device associated with one of the individuals, to track the location of the individual. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Nelson (Nelson, col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 19).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Goldenberg, Causey and Stutman with Nelson. The motivation would have been to enhance remote monitoring of medical devices on a chronic basis to deliver clinical therapy in real-time (Nelson, Abstract).

B. As per claims 10 and 46, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method wherein instructions transmitted over the network to a health-care service include the location of an individual. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Nelson (Nelson, col. 4, line 50-co1.5, line 19).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Goldenberg, Stutman and Causey with Nelson is as provided in the rejection of claims 9 and 45 and is incorporated herein by reference.

C. As per claims 23 and 59, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method wherein the personal data storage unit allows access to a database on which medical records relating to the individual are stored. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Nelson, (Nelson, Abstract; Fig. 5; col. 7, line 15-col. 8, line 47).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Goldenberg, Stutman

and Causey with Nelson is as provided in the rejection of claims 9 and 45 and is incorporated herein by reference.

D. As per claims 27 and 63, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method further comprising a portable processing device, wherein the personal data storage unit is operable to transfer data stored therein to the portable processing device. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Nelson (Nelson, Fig. 4, col. 7, line 45-67; col. 13, lines 11-38).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Goldenberg, Stutman and Causey with Nelson is as provided in the rejection of claims 9 and 45 and is incorporated herein by reference.

E. As per claims 25 and 61, Goldenberg and Causey fails to disclose a system and method wherein the personal data storage unit is operable to connect to the network by a wireless connection or by a contact connection.

However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Nelson, (Nelson, Fig. 4, col. 7, line 45-67; col. 13, lines 11-38).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Goldenberg, Stutman

and Causey with Nelson is as provided in the rejection of claims 9 and 45 and is incorporated herein by reference.

5. Claims 24, 26, 29, 60, 62, 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldenberg, in view of Causey and Stutman, and further in view of Snowden et al. (hereinafter Snowden) (U.S. Pub. 2002/00226332).

A. As per claims 24 and 60, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method wherein the personal data storage unit is programmed to allow access to selected portions of medical records of the individual to selected entities. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Snowden, (Snowden, Abstract; ¶¶ 77-79) (disclosing patient-controlled access to selected portions of medical records).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of Claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Goldenberg, Stutman and Causey with Snowden. The motivation would have been to create a secure repository for personal medical records accessible in selected parts over secure lines (Snowden, Abstract).

B. As per claims 26 and 62, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method wherein the personal data storage unit comprises a smart card. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Snowden (Snowden, Abstract, ¶ 105).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided

in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Goldenberg, Stutman and Causey with Snowden is as provided in the rejection of claims 24 and 60 and is incorporated herein by reference.

C. As per claims 29 and 65, Goldenberg fails to disclose a system and method wherein, the access of the selected entities to the selected portions of the records expires after a predetermined period. However, such claimed systems and methods are well-known in the art as evidenced by Snowden, (Snowden, 105-109) (disclosing emergency access of patient records by emergency health personnel wherein it would be obvious that the permission for access would expire after the emergency was over).

The motivation to combine Goldenberg with Causey and Stutman is as provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 37 and incorporated herein by reference.

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Goldenberg, Stutman and Causey with Snowden is as provided in the rejection of claims 24 and 60 and is incorporated herein by reference.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DILEK B. COBANOGLU whose telephone number is (571)272-8295. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.
10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher L. Gilligan can be reached on 571-272-6770. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 3626

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. B. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3626
6/19/2008

/C Luke Gilligan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626